

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,509	09/08/2003	Kazuaki Nakamura	KON-1818	9322
20311 7	590 09/20/2005		EXAMINER	
LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP		CHEA, THORL		
475 PARK AV 15TH FLOOR	ENUE SOUTH		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK,	NY 10016		1752	

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action						
Before	the Filing of an Appeal Brief					

		,
Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/657,509	NAKAMURA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Thorl Chea	1752	

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
•	•					
	Thorl Chea	1752				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe		•	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 29 August 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AI		- ·				
 ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) ☐ The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) ☑ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. 						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi te of the final rejection, o	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as even if timely filed,			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of le appeal. Since			
AMENDMENTS						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co	but prior to the date of filing a brief,	will <u>not</u> be entered b	ecause			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		i L below),				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.				
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13		mpliant Amendment ((PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)						
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).	•	•	•			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: None.		l be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>None</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-18</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	it before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a l).			
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.			
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 			nce because:			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	o(s)				
		Thokhun				
		Thorl Chea Primary Examiner				

Art Unit: 1752

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the chaning of the depency of 2 to 9 under claim 15 further limit the scope of the compound of formula (1) of claim 15 change the scope of the claims and therefore such limitation require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: because of the reason set forth in the Final Office action. The Examiner's position with respect to the Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 on March 23, 2005 is not changed for the reason set forth in the Final Office Action. The results shown in the Declaration is also insuffient to determine the unexpected results of the claimed invention in view of the applied prior art. The results shown in Table 4 of the Declaration is related to the material made according to Fukui but this material is processed according to Oya. Therefore, it is impsosible to determine the results shown therein in view of the results shown in Fukui et al. The argument with respect to the difference between value of fog due to the different manners of evaluation is based on the Counsel's assertion, and Counsel's arguments cannot take the place of evidence. In re Greenfield, 571 F. 2d 1185, 197 USPQ 227 (CCPA 1978). There is no statement in the Declaration stated that the material of the results shown in the Declaration would have been unexpected to the worker of ordinary skill in the art eventough its fog value found to be higher than that disclosed in Fukui et al. The results shown in the Declaration are also confusing. See Tables 4-5, under the column of Dmax. These values appear to be related to the sensitivy rather than the value of Dmax. The Dmax value cannot be determined. There is no comparison between the color tone disclosed in Fukui et al and that of the claimed invention. The Declaration is not commeusrate with the scope of the claimed invention. See the scope of the compound of formula (1) and (3) in claim 15 for instance. The scope of the compound encompasses an indefinite numer of substituents disclosed in Fukui et al of formula (III) in claim 11 while only a single compound of formula 2-3 is used therein. No Terminal Disclaimer ha been been submitted. Therefore, the rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousnesstype double patenting is maintained.